



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,075	12/13/2001	William J. Stegmeier SR.	P-A969	9855

26399 7590 09/15/2003

THE LAW OFFICES OF H. DENNIS KELLY
2401 TURTLE CREEK
DALLAS, TX 75219

EXAMINER

DRODGE, JOSEPH W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1723	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/020,075	STEGMEIER ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Joseph W. Drodge	1723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

NON-FINAL REJECTION

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In each of claims 8 and 9 "the nail guiding means" lacks antecedent basis since the terminology is inconsistent with "...parallel planar projections" within independent claim 7.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 7,8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stegmeier patent 4,815,888.

Stegmeier '888 discloses a deck drain 10 having top section 48, mid section (upper portion of walls 20 and 22 including formation 30) and lower main channel (lower portions of chamber 18 within walls 20 and 22. Also disclosed are a pair of parallel (with respect to an axis extending linearly along the length of the drain) projections 54 that are attached to and extend from the mid-section of the drain (column 4, lines 24-25) which function as means to guide securing rod means 56. Further disclosed are securing and attaching nails 31 that extend through guiding notches 29 in the lower portions of the drain (column 3, lines 38-41).

With respect to claims 8 and 11, see planar base plate 26 and with respect to claim 10, see top face 42 having openings 44.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stegmeier patent 4,815,888 in view of Molitor patent 4,007,566 and Bishop patent 3,546,719.

Claims 1 and 2 differ from Stegmeier '888 in requiring that the guiding means are for nails and that they extend from the top section of the drain. However, Molitor teaches to attach similar securing means "machine screws" from mid or upper section of deck drain (see screws 50 guided within rosettes 52 as described in column 6, line 31 through column 7, line 11). Bishop teaches securing bolts 38 extending distinctly from the top of the side walls of a deck drain. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Stegmeier '888 deck drain assembly by installation of guiding means for nails extending from the mid-section or top of the drain, as taught by Molitor and Bishop, so as to better support the drain during its installation by preventing twisting and distortion of the drain during its installation (see particularly column 2, lines 35-52 of Molitor).

Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 3 and claims dependent therefrom distinguish in view of recitation of the guiding means including a pair of parallel planar projections. The prior art does not suggest any motivation or admit to any problem that would require guiding of nails through such parallel projections during nailing.

Claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 9 would distinguish in view of recitation of a flange attached to the distal ends of the parallel planar projections. The prior art suggests projections immediately adjacent the side walls of the drain as sufficient to place and guide securing or attachment means including nails, bolts or screws.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or other matters regarding prosecution of this application should be directed to examiner Joseph Drodge whose telephone number is 703-308-0403 between the hours of 8:30 AM and 4:45 PM on Monday-Friday. The Fax number for the Group is 703-892-9306.


JOSEPH DRODGE
PRIMARY EXAMINER